ISSUE TRACKING INDEX

An integral part of the environmental process has been a comprehensive effort to consult and coordinate with relevant agencies and the public. The intent throughout the process has been to communicate with the public and agencies, identify and refine their issues, interpret the issues into meaningful information to incorporate into the planning and decision making, and address the issues in the EIS. This comprehensive effort of consultation and coordination has been accomplished through three primary means: (1) agency and public scoping of issues early in the EIS process, (2) contacting agencies during the process to obtain technical information, and (3) conducting community participation throughout the process.

Overall, the goal of the scoping process was to determine the issues to be addressed in the EIS. Scoping is a process, early in a project and open to federal, state, and local agencies and the public, intended to incorporate their views and concerns regarding the Project. Other objectives of scoping included evaluating issues, determining the range of alternatives to be evaluated, identifying environmental review and consultation requirements, and developing the environmental analysis process and technical studies to address scoping issues in the EIS.

Specifically, issues identified during scoping include the following:

- Purpose of and Need for the Project
- Urban and Rural Land Use
- Aviation Safety
- Recreation and Tourism
- Management Plans
- Watershed Management and Soil Erosion
- Visual Resources
- Biology
- Cultural Resources
- Right-of-Way Limitations
- Health and Safety
- Avalanche Hazards
- Socioeconomics
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The table on the following pages has been provided to assist the reader in tracking generally where these issues are addressed in the document. The index includes a list of specific comments received that fall into the 14 categories listed above, as well as a general guide to sections in the document where the issues are addressed. For more specific information regarding the scoping process and issue identification, refer to Chapter 4 – Scoping, Consultation, and Coordination.

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
1	**Purpose and Need for the Project**	**Underlying Need** ■ Unable to determine the underlying need for the transmission line. Need should be clearly defined and a reasonable range of alternatives for the project should be evaluated, such as energy conservation, local generation, system, and transmission alternatives. ■ The need for the project is not justified by the potential significant environmental impacts and questionable economic justification. **Reliability** ■ The purpose and need would not be met by constructing a transmission line parallel to the Quartz Creek line due to avalanche risks. ■ Is reliability of power the main reason for the project? ■ What increase in reliability would construction of the new transmission line provide? ■ Current reliability of service from the existing transmission line system is acceptable in the Anchorage and Kenai areas. Residents are willing to put up with occasional power outages instead of the potential environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed project. ■ What is the difference between historical outages and present risk of outages (especially related to avalanches) after modifications have been included to the existing transmission line? ■ What is the cost and extent of current unreliability? ■ Reliability and efficiency would not be met by routing the transmission line through avalanche areas. **Energy Transfer** ■ What is the status of existing energy transfer between Kenai and Anchorage?	■ Need – Chapter 1, Section 1.3 – Purpose and Need for the Project Alternatives – Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1 – Alternatives to a Transmission Option; Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options; Appendix A – Comparison of Other Routing Alternatives ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4 – Project Benefits and Costs; Appendix D – Mitigation; Chapter 3, Section 3.7.3 – Rate Impacts from the Project ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Avalanche Hazards" ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3 – Purposed and Need for the Project ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability, "Improved Reliability" ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability, "System Deficiency"; Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Upgrade of the Existing Quartz Creek Line" (page 2-8), "Avalanche Hazards" (page 2-13), "Avalanche Mitigation" (page 2-17) ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability, "System Deficiency" ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Avalanche Hazards" and "Avalanche Mitigation" (pgs. 2-13 through 2-19) ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.2.1 – How the Existing System is Operated

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
	Purpose and Need for the Project (continued)	**Benefits** ■ The proposed Project would only benefit Anchorage (or only Kenai). ■ The Kenai and Anchorage areas independently have enough generation capacity. ■ Would expanded power service from the route be available for local residents to utilize? (Principally Moose Point, Gray Cliffs, and Fire Island.)	■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4 – Project Benefits and Costs ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.3 – Economic Generation, "System Deficiency" ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability; Section 1.4 – Project Benefits and Costs
2	**Urban and Rural Land Use**	■ Quartz Creek would have the least amount of environmental impacts and minimize impacts on residential neighborhoods. ■ The possibility of lawsuits from diminished property values is associated with Enstar. ■ The transmission line crossing residential lots would result in diminished property value. ■ Does Alaska Railroad and Chugach Electric have the right to route a line along the railroad right-of-way? ■ Avoid highly developed residential areas. ■ Do not construct overhead transmission lines in residential areas. ■ How would the proposed Project affect property owners? ■ Proposed Project routing should consider potential zoning conflicts and land use changes as a result of the revision to the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan. ■ Transmission lines should be planned in advance of residential and commercial development. ■ Right-of-way encroachment is a possibility with New Seward Highway and North Kenai Road. ■ Route lines through industrial areas (more compatible land use). ■ The western coast of the Kenai Peninsula is desirable for development; the transmission line could be a conflict. ■ North Kenai schools could be in close proximity; this would not be acceptable.	■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2 – Right-of-Way Acquisition Process ■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Municipality of Anchorage Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2 – Right-of-Way Acquisition Process ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Kenai Peninsula Borough Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Land Use and Recreation

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
3	**Aviation Safety**	**<u>Compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Regulations</u>** ■ The FAA would need to conduct a hazard determination, which would identify potential problems (flight hazards, electrical interference) and any necessary mitigation measures (marker balls, lighting). ■ Project must comply with FAA navigation facilities standards. **<u>Potential Conflicts with Aircraft Use</u>** ■ The Tesoro Route presents a particular hazard for low flying aircraft that frequent the area during inclement weather. ■ Underground transmission lines would mitigate flight hazards near airports, float plane lakes, or beach strips, and avoid conflicts with planned expansion at Anchorage International Airport. ■ Flying Crown Airstrip in Oceanview would be shut down; transmission line would create flying hazard.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.2 – Land Use, Wire Marking Requirements, – CEA's Policies Regarding Aviation Demarcation Requirements ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.2 – Land Use, Aviation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.3 – Alternatives, "Tesoro Route Alternatives" (Land Use) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.2 – Land Use, Aviation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.2 – Land Use, Aviation; Section 3.6.3 – Alternatives Oceanview to International Substation via Alaska railroad – Route Option K (Enstar Route) (Aviation)
4	**Recreation and Tourism**	■ Potter Marsh and Quartz Creek are heavily used for recreation. ■ Project would alter the landscape and eliminate the wilderness values. ■ Potential conflict with proposed Tony Knowles Coastal Trail. Current policy is to underground all transmission lines. ■ Avoid impacts on Chugach State Park. ■ Sixmile Creek drainage is sensitive because of recreational use. ■ Avoid impacts on trails including Resurrection Trail. ■ Would submarine routes affect sport fishing in Cook Inlet?	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Alaska Department of Natural Resources Plan; Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.1 – Visual Resources Overview, Visual Assessment; Appendix D - Mitigation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.3 – Alternatives, Pt. Campbell to Pt. Woronzof – Route Option N ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Chugach State Park" (page 2-12) ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Sixmile Creek to Anchorage – Submarine" (page 2-19) ■ Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.9 – Marine Environment

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
5	**Manage-ment Plans**	■ Conservation easement at mouth of Sixmile Creek. ■ Project would require an amendment to the KNWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan. ■ How would Chugach National Forest administration incorporate this Project into the updated Forest Plan? ■ Right-of-way along Enstar Route would be incompatible with the KNWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan. ■ The 1992 recommendations in the Kenai Peninsula Borough Plan include "Maintain scenic quality and unique and rural setting of Cooper Landing." ■ To what extent would implementation of the proposed Project require additional efforts by land management staff (such as increased patrols for trespassers)? ■ Both New Seward Highway and Minnesota Drive are controlled access rights-of-way, which restrict the ability to construct or maintain the Project from the road. ■ Land and Water Conservation Funds have been used in Captain Cook State Recreation Area and Chugach State Park providing limitations to additional development within the park boundaries. ■ The Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan is currently being revised and the municipal planning department anticipates that changes may directly relate to siting the proposed Project. A cooperative effort with the plan update should be considered. ■ State tidelands and other lands managed by the Alaska Department of Natural Resources must comply with the Alaska Coastal Management Plan. ■ The Municipality of Anchorage utility corridor plan is not designed for this type of project. ■ Project must comply with the Kenai River Special Management Plan.	■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Quartz Creek Parallel Route" (page 2-11) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, KNWR Comprehensive Management Plan ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Chugach National Forest" (page 2-12) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, KNWR Comprehensive Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Kenai Peninsula Borough Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Municipality of Anchorage Management Plan ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Chugach State Park" (page 2-12) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Municipality of Anchorage Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Alaska Department of Natural Resources Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Municipality of Anchorage Management Plan ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Alaska Department of Natural Resources Management Plan

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
6	**Watershed Manage-ment and Soil Erosion**	■ Potter Marsh is vulnerable to silt input from any construction in the vicinity. ■ Minimize change to bluffs along Kenai River and the Cook Inlet coastline. ■ Minimize right-of-way clearing requirements to the maximum extent possible. ■ The environmental and permitting process should be conducted concurrently. Coordination with the Section 404 permit should also be considered.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.4.6 – Alternatives, Enstar "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation" (page 3-33) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3 – Alternatives (Earth and Water Resources) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3 – Alternatives (Earth and Water Resources)
7	**Visual Resources**	**<u>Residential and Recreational Viewsheds</u>** ■ What would the proposed transmission line look like? ■ Overhead lines along roadways within the Anchorage Bowl would adversely affect local neighborhoods. ■ Visual impacts on residential areas need to be evaluated in terms of loss of property value and sense of place (specifically, Cooper Landing, Kenai, south Anchorage, Moose Point, Gray Cliffs, and Pt. Possession). Cooper Landing recently completed a community planning effort that identified preservation of aesthetics as a desired attribute. ■ The proposed Project should avoid the KNWR due to the high scenic value. **<u>Design Considerations</u>** ■ Recommend the use of the existing route to minimize aesthetic impacts. ■ Possibly construct a new line and remove the old facilities. ■ Project alternatives should include design elements that would eliminate or minimize adverse effects on aesthetic qualities of the area. Suggest undergrounding the line when crossing visually sensitive areas.	■ Appendix E – Drawings and Simulations ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.1 – Visual Resources Overview, Visual Assessment, "Travelways" (page 3-235) ■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 3, Section 3.9.2 – Alternatives (Visual) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.2 – Alternatives, Enstar to Chickaloon Bay – Route Option F ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2 – Alternatives Studied and Eliminated from Detailed Study ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.2 – Alternatives (Visual)

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
	Visual Resources (continued)	**Viewsheds from Travelways** ■ Visual impacts may affect residents and tourists who travel the Seward Highway National Scenic Byway, Sterling Highway, and Turnagain Pass, or who visit Summit Lake, Stormy Lake, Cooper Landing, Swan Lake, and Sixmile River (Quartz Creek Route). ■ Recommend undergrounding the lines through urban areas. ■ Enstar seems to minimize disturbance and visual issues on the Peninsula.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.1 Visual Assessment, Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.9.2 – Alternatives (Visual)
8	**Biology**	**Wetlands** ■ Draft EIS should identify wetland types, acreage, and location, and assess wetland functions and values. All construction activities should avoid high resource wetlands A and B in Anchorage and wetlands in the KNWR to the maximum extent practicable. ■ If wetlands cannot be avoided, implementation of Best Management Practices should be used to minimize effects. The draft EIS should include a discussion of the Best Management Practices. ■ Additional clearing would have impacts on wetlands that are already compromised. **Management** ■ Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) requires burial of transmission line through Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. ■ ADF&G recommends boring underneath the vegetated portions of the refuge. ■ Chickaloon Bay is a state critical habitat area. ■ Is there a possibility of spruce bark beetle increase? **Sensitive Species** ■ Avoid disturbance to sensitive wildlife species, including brown bear, lynx, wolf, trumpeter swan, and bald eagle. ■ There is a high density of brown bears on the Chickaloon River. ■ Enstar Route would disrupt critical brown bear habitat. ■ Caribou wintering and calving grounds are along the Enstar Route.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1 – Terrestrial - Vegetation, "Wetlands" (page 3-37), Section 3.5.2 "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation/Wetland Vegetation" ■ Above sections, plus Appendix D – Mitigation, General Mitigation ■ See above sections ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1 – Terrestrial - Vegetation, "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation/Wetland Vegetation" (page 3-39); Section 3.5.2 – Alternatives (page 3-41) ■ See above section ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.2 – Alternatives (Route Options F-I, page 3-45) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1 – Terrestrial - Vegetation, "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation" (page 3-38); Section 3.5.1 – Alternatives (page 3-41) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "General Environmental Consequences and Mitigation for Wildlife" (page 3-63)

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
	Biology (continued)	**Wildlife Habitat** ■ Project would irretrievably alter the landscape reducing wildlife habitat (hydraulic alterations would impact wildlife and habitat). ■ Minimize adverse effects on fish and wildlife habitat. ■ Cumulative impacts on wildlife and habitat need to be addressed. ■ Proposed Project may improve some types of wildlife habitat. **Waterfowl** ■ Effects on waterfowl from overhead lines should be mitigated. ■ Chickaloon Bay is a migration staging area. ■ The Environmental Analysis (EVAL) and EIS should have a discussion on Potter Marsh waterfowl. **Fisheries** ■ Would fish be impacted by damaged submarine cables? ■ Siltation as a result of construction would adversely impact fish.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "General Environmental Consequences and Mitigation for Wildlife/Brown Bears" (page 3-59) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "Enstar Route" (page 3-83) ■ See above section, plus Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "General Environmental Consequences and Mitigation for Wildlife/Caribou" (page 3-62) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.1 – Terrestrial - Vegetation, "Wetlands" (page 3-37), "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation" (page 3-38); Section 3.5.2. - Alternatives (page 3-41) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.2 – Alternatives (page 3-41) ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "General Environmental Consequences and Mitigation for Wildlife/Birds" (page 3-63) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.3 – Terrestrial - Wildlife, "General Description/Waterfowl" (page 3-58) ■ See both sections mentioned above ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.9 – Marine Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation; Appendix D – Mitigation, General Mitigation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.5.5 – Freshwater Environment, Aquatic Communities, "Environmental Consequences and Mitigation/Anadromous Fish" (page 3-99)

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
9	**Cultural Resources**	**Concerns Expressed by Kenai Native Association** ■ Archaeological resources need to be addressed in the EIS. ■ Areas surrounding Cooper Landing and Kenai River have high densities of cultural sites. ■ Increased access may result in damage to unknown archaeological and historical properties. ■ Native groups should be allowed to participate in survey work. ■ Proposed Project may hamper traditional usage. ■ Avoid disturbance to burial grounds at Pt. Possession. ■ Avoid use of Native lands for proposed project, specifically the Pt. Possession Native Group.	For all cultural issues: ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.10 – Cultural Resources
10	**Right-of-Way Limitations**	**Use of Right-of-Way** ■ The ADOT/PF has restricted access along most of their rights-of-way. ■ Expansion of Enstar Pipeline right-of-way conflicts with the KNWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan. ■ Would public access be available along the right-of-way for the proposed Project? ■ Would an easement or right-of-way be required on adjoining properties for maintenance access? ■ The proposed Project would increase the chance of trespassers because of the 150-foot right-of-way that would invite usage. ■ Can the right-of-way accommodate recreational trails? ■ Suggest consolidating right-of-way with other projects; comprehensive planning should be considered instead of piece-by-piece planning. ■ Use existing right-of-way, even if it must be widened. **Right-of-Way Requirements** ■ Minimize right-of-way width. ■ Would the right-of-way be 150 feet wide in residential areas and how would that affect property owners? ■ The only mitigation that should be required by the utilities for this action should be funds required to reclaim the land at the end of the Project.	For all right-of-way issues: ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2 – Right-of-Way Acquisition Process; in addition, see the following sections to address individual issues: ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.3 – Alternatives (Land Use); Chapter 2, Section 2.5.3 – Construction Access, Overhead Facilities ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdictions and Management Plans, KNWR Comprehensive Management Plan ■ Appendix D – Mitigation (page D-4, measure 4) ■ Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Appendix D – Mitigation (page D-4, measure 4) ■ Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.3 – Construction Access; Appendix D – Mitigation ■ See above sections ■ Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Appendix D – Mitigation ■ Appendix D – Mitigation

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
11	**Health and Safety**	■ Effects of EMF need to be addressed in the draft EIS. ■ Potential hazards of the transmission line include EMF negatively affecting nearby residents and systems in homes. ■ Transmission lines and schools are not compatible due to the potential health effects (along North Kenai Road). **<u>Physical Hazards</u>** ■ Can gas lines be located close to electrical transmission lines without danger of explosion or fire? ■ Transmission lines should be buried to protect human safety. ■ Falling lines can be a hazard to people or property. ■ Request information on the magnitude of the electrical hazard to humans and wildlife and the effects of a spill from insulating oil.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.11.2 – Environmental Consequences, Electric and Magnetic Fields ■ See above section ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.11.2 – Environmental Consequences, Electric and Magnetic Fields ■ Appendix B – Construction Activities, "Hazards" (page B-24) ■ Appendix B – Construction Activities, "Hazards" (page B-24) ■ Appendix B – Construction Activities, "Hazards" (page B-24) ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.11.2 – Environmental Consequences, Electric and Magnetic Fields; Chapter 3, Section 3.5.9 – Marine Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation/Marine Mammals
12	**Avalanche Hazards**	■ Need to weigh consequences of building additional line along right-of-way known for avalanche problems. ■ Designing an additional line through extended avalanche zone is illogical, when better alternatives are available. Risk to the power grid would be increased and net reliability reduced. Designing an additional transmission line to be operated at zero load under avalanche conditions is not cost-effective and does not represent good public policy.	■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Avalanche Hazards" (page 2-13) ■ See above section
13	**Socio-economics**	**<u>Utility Rates</u>** ■ What effect would construction costs have on utility rates? ■ Would the new line reduce the cost of power in the future? ■ No individual should carry the burden for all rate payers. ■ Would utility rates increase? ■ What is the current and projected cost of electricity?	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.3 – Rate Impacts from the Project ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ See above section

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
	Socio-economics (continued)	**Quality of Life** ■ Quality of life would suffer if the proposed Project is introduced into an area not currently used as a utility corridor. ■ What impact would the Tesoro Route have on people and how many would be affected by the Quartz Creek Route? ■ Impacts on local communities should be considered. ■ Utilize a proactive community outreach program to involve the general public in the decision process. **Project Cost** ■ Concerned with cost comparisons of options. ■ Is the main difference in route costs associated with the submarine cables? ■ How much (percentage-wise) would it cost to bury the route? ■ Are submarine alternatives economically feasible? **Cost Benefit Analysis** ■ Cost benefit analysis needs to be updated to reflect current market conditions. ■ When would the benefits accrue? ■ Where are the benefits coming from? ■ How much taxpayer money is going into this Project? ■ Where is the money coming from to fund this Project? **Effect of the Proposed Project** ■ Would landowners directly affected by the right-of-way be compensated? ■ Economic savings versus losses to Peninsula communities should be considered. **Development** ■ What are the economic benefits to the communities in the Project area? ■ What are the electrical benefits to the communities in the Project area and the Railbelt? **Environmental Justice** Consider environmental justice for the residents of the trailer park at Minnesota Drive and Dimond Boulevard.	■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.2 – Socioeconomic Consequences of the Proposed Action ■ See above section; Chapter 2, Section 2.6 – Alternative Route Comparison ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.2 – Socioeconomic Consequences of the Proposed Action ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1 – Construction and Life Cycle Costs ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1 – Construction and Life Cycle Costs ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Enstar Pipeline Corridor, "Bury the Line through KNWR" (page 2-23) ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1 – Construction and Lifecycle Costs, "Submarine Cable Replacement Costs" (page 1-32) ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.4 – Project Benefit and Costs ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ See above section ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2 – Right-of-Way Acquisition Process ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.2 – Socioeconomic Consequences of the Proposed Action; Chapter 3, Section 3.7.3 – Rate Impacts from the Project ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.2 – Socioeconomic Consequences of the Proposed Action ■ Chapter 1, Section 1.3.1 – Reliability ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.7.4 – Environmental Justice

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
14	**Alternatives to the Proposed Project**	**<u>Alternatives to a New Line</u>** ■ Evaluate alternative means of constructing, operating, and maintaining transmission lines to minimize environmental impacts. ■ The full range of reasonable and feasible alternatives should be evaluated, including energy conservation, local generation, system, fuel cells, wind generation, and transmission alternatives. ■ System selected for final approval should be the most efficient, cost effective, and easiest to maintain and operate. ■ More information needs to be presented in terms of why alternatives such as energy conservation are not feasible solutions to the proposed Project. The EVAL should also discuss which energy conservation measures were considered and why they were rejected, what could be done instead of building the intertie. ■ Corridor should incorporate an access road along the coast (Tesoro alternative). There is potential to incorporate a causeway across Turnagain Arm. ■ Avoid a submarine crossing from Pt. Possession to Pt. Woronzof by running a route along the north shore of the Kenai Peninsula to Chickaloon Bay, then cross Turnagain Arm to South Anchorage. ■ Use existing transmission line corridor and tie into existing substations. Suggest removal of old 115kV and 69kV transmission lines, thus improving the aesthetic value of the area. ■ Consider routing a submarine cable along Quartz Creek to Sixmile to Hope and across Turnagain Arm to Potter Marsh. **<u>Alternative Feasibility</u>** ■ Route selection should be flexible to allow avoidance of sensitive areas. ■ What options have been considered for various environmentally sensitive areas and avalanche zones? ■ Rationale and criteria for the elimination of alternatives should be documented and presented clearly in the EVAL and EIS. ■ Alternatives that do not increase reliable and efficient energy transfer (the purpose and need for the Project) should not be considered in the EVAL.	■ Chapter 2, Section 2.5.5 – Operation, Maintenance, and Abandonment ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2 – Alternatives Studied and Eliminated from Detailed Study ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.6.3 – Applicant's Proposed Alternative ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1 – Alternatives to a Transmission Option ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Tesoro Pipeline Corridor, "Submarine Crossings – Turnagain Arm" (page 2-22) ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options ■ Appendix A – Comparison of Other Routing Alternatives; Chapter 2, Section 2.6 – Alternative Route Comparison

ISSUES TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	**Comments Received**	**DEIS Index**
	Alternatives to the Proposed Project (continued)	■ Consider a range of alternative construction techniques to minimize environmental impacts (burying substantial portions of the route, using modified tower designs, etc.). ■ Discourage use of existing Quartz Creek Route because the same "natural menaces" would be doubled. ■ Overhead and underground lines are more accessible and safer than submarine lines. ■ Submarine crossings are not practical due to cost and engineering feasibility. ■ If Project follows railroad, it should be placed underground. ■ Resolutions have been passed by Bayshore, Klatt, and Oceanview community councils against locating the Project within their communities. ■ Routing should be different than current line and should have substations to provide local power. ■ The EIS should provide a discussion on the relationship of the Northern Intertie and Southern Intertie Projects and the anticipated operation of the completed network, and any impacts associated with the operation of the electrical network.	■ Appendix C – Inventory Study and Impact Assessment Methods; Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor, "Avalanche Hazards" (page 2-13) ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2 – Alternatives Studied and Eliminated from Detailed Study ■ See above section ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.4 – Alternative Route Facilities ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.4 – Alternative Route Facilities ■ See above section ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Underground Line Alternatives; Chapter 3, Section 3.6.1 – Land Jurisdiction and Management Plans, Alaska Railroad Corporation ■ Chapter 3, Section 3.12 – Cumulative Impact Analysis ■ Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2 – Transmission Options, Quartz Creek Transmission Corridor; Chapter 2, Section 2.4.5 – Substations